



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

96

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,461	11/21/2003	Kjell-Tore Smith	115700	8061
29078	7590	03/09/2006	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIAN D. ABEL			GELLNER, JEFFREY L	
ONSAGERS AS				
POSTBOKS 6963 ST. OLAVS PLESS			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NORWAY, N-0130			3643	
NORWAY			DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/717,461	SMITH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeffrey L. Gellner	3643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

Acknowledgement is made of Applicants' IDSs received 11 February 2004, 6 June 2005, and 7 June 2005. The references on the returned SB08s that were crossed out were not found in a search of the image file.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election of species Aa in the reply filed on 29 December 2005 is acknowledged. As to the plasticizer species, because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). As to the elastomer species, upon consideration of Applicants' argument in the reply received 29 December 2005, Examiner withdraws this requirement and considers Hy Temp 4054 and Hy Temp 4454 to be not patently distinct.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3-5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 3, line 3, the language of “preferably from 91 to 93% by weight” is indefinite because narrow and broader ranges in the same claim are not permitted (see MPEP 2173.05(c)(1)).

In claim 4, line 3, the language of “in the range 60 to 170 $\mu$ m, preferably in the range 60-90 $\mu$ m” and line 5 the language of “preferably 12-18 $\mu$ m” is indefinite because narrow and broader ranges in the same claim are not permitted (see MPEP 2173.05(c)(1)).

In claim 5, lines 3-4, the language of “preferably from 44 to 56% by weight” is indefinite because narrow and broader ranges in the same claim are not permitted (see MPEP 2173.05(c)(1)).

In claim 7, line 3, the language of “preferably from 5 to 15% by weight more preferably from 9 to 11%” is indefinite because narrow and broader ranges in the same claim are not permitted (see MPEP 2173.05(c)(1)).

In claim 8, line 2, the language of “preferably from 5 to 20 $\mu$ m by weight more preferably from 8 to 14  $\mu$ m” is indefinite because narrow and broader ranges in the same claim are not permitted (see MPEP 2173.05(c)(1)).

Claims 12-13, 15, and 16 have similar language as disclosed above.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hofmann et al.(US. 6,884,307 B1) in view of Lavertu et al. (US 4,065,529).

As to claims 1, 2, 4, 6, Hofmann et al. discloses a composition of an explosive with a poly acrylic elastomer , Hy Temp (col. 4, example 1), and a plasticizer, DOA ( col. 4, example 1), a portion of the explosive with fine crystals in the range of 2 to 30 $\mu$ m or 12 to 18  $\mu$ m ("15  $\mu$ m" at col. 4, example 1). Not disclosed is the explosive being RDX, Type I, or RDX Type I and HMX and course crystals having a size of 50 to 250 $\mu$ m or 60 to 90  $\mu$ m. Hofmann et al., itself, discloses the use of RDX (col. 3 lines 19-24; and RDX is known to have contain HMX as an impurity) and Lavertu et al. discloses the use of RDX crystals having a size of from 50 to 250  $\mu$ m or 60 to 90  $\mu$ m (col. 3, table I). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the composition of Hofmann et al. by using RDX as disclosed by Hofmann et al. and RDX type I depending upon use and having the crystals with a size of from 50 to 250 $\mu$ m as disclosed by Lavertu et al. so as to achieve better packing (see Lavertu et al. at col. 1 lines 31-40).

As to claims 3 and 5, the limitations of claims 1 and 2 are disclosed as described above. Not disclosed is the explosive being 91 to 93% or 44 to 56 % weight of the composition. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the composition of Hofmann et al. as modified by Lavertu et al. by having the explosive from 91 to 93% or 44 to 56% weight depending upon the results need to be achieved.

As to claim 7, the limitations of claim 2 are disclosed as described above. Not disclosed is the HMX being 9 to 11% weight of the composition. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the composition of

Hofmann et al. as modified by Lavertu et al. by having the HMX from 9 to 11% weight depending upon the results need to be achieved.

As to claim 8, Hofmann et al. as modified by Lavertu et al. further disclose HMX crystals at a size of 8 to 14  $\mu\text{m}$  (see Hofmann et al. at col. 4, example 1).

As to claims 9-16, Hofmann et al. as modified by Lavertu et al. disclose the explosive composition as described above. Additionally, MPEP 2113 Product-by-Process claims state that “[i]f the product in the product-by-process claim is the same or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art product was made by a different process.” Here, the explosive composition made in water-slurry process is obvious in light of Hofmann et al. as modified by Lavertu et al. since the explosive composition is not a patentable distinction.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey L. Gellner whose telephone number is 571.272.6887. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30-4:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Peter Poon can be reached on 571.272.6891. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jeffrey L. Gellner  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3643